



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/039,740

01/03/2002

Adam T. Lake

42390.P13351

1131

7590

05/15/2006

James H. Salter

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman Name LLP

Seventh Floor

12400 Wilshire Boulevard

Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

PITARO, RYAN F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 05/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/039,740

Applicant(s)

LAKE ET AL.

Examiner

Ryan F. Pitaro

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-27 have been examined.

***Response to Amendment***

2. This communication is responsive to Amendment C, filed 2/16/2006.
3. Claims 1-27 are pending in this application. Claims 1,10,17,25 are independent claims. In the Amendment C, Claims 1-27 were amended. This action is Final.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1-4,7-20,23-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Megiddo et al ("Megiddo", US 6,892,181) in view of Muto et al ("Muto", US 2002/0027570).

As per independent claim 1, Megiddo discloses a method to view information comprising: displaying a first web page having dynamically changing information content segments (Column 4 lines 37-45); dynamically changing one or more of the information content segments (Column 1 lines 31-45); ordering a list of information

Art Unit: 2174

content segments that have previously appeared on the first web page, wherein said web page is displayed in a first area of an information display (Figure 3b); and includes the information content segments that have previously appeared on the web page (Figure 3b, old ads); associating the list of information content segments with the first web page (Figure 3b), and displaying the list of information content segments to be viewed concurrently with the first web page (Column 4 lines 16-20, Figure 3b). Megiddo fails to distinctly point out a second web page. However, Muto teaches displaying a representation of the second web page ([0014] lines 1-16. Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the multiple web page display of Muto with the method of Megiddo. Motivation to do so would have been to provide a web page image formation scheme capable of reducing the system load and accounting for the latest WWW specifications appropriately by distributing the Web page acquisition and image formation processing and utilizing the existing Web browser.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Megiddo discloses a method wherein said ordering is a selected one of the group consisting of a chronological order of display (Figure 3b, old ads listed first, new ads listed second), a topical order of display, a random order of display, and a combination thereof.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Megiddo discloses a method associating said first area of said information display with said list of information content segments (Figure 3b).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Megiddo discloses a method wherein said associating places said first area of said information display proximate to said list of information content segments (Figure 3b).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Megiddo discloses a method further comprising navigating through said list of information content segments (Column 4 lines 31-37).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Megiddo discloses a method wherein navigating is performed with at least one of a scroll bar, a button, and a voice command (Col 4 lines 31-37; clickable small square).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Megiddo discloses a method wherein said information content is an advertisement (Figure 3b, 320,322).

Claims 10,17,25 are individually similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 11,18,26 are individually similar in scope to claim 2 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 12,19 are individually similar in scope to claim 3 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 13,20 are individually similar in scope to claim 4 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 14,23,27 are individually similar in scope to claim 7 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 15,24 are individually similar in scope to claim 8 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to claim 9 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

4. Claims 5,6,21,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Megiddo et al ("Megiddo", US 6,892,181) and Muto et al ("Muto", US 2002/0027570) in further view of Rice ("Rice", US# 6486891).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Megiddo-Muto fails to disclose a method wherein said information display is a projection of light on a surface. However Rice teaches a method wherein said information display is a projection of light on a surface (Column 4 lines 15-16). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Megiddo-Muto's method with Rice's teaching. Motivation to so do would have been to allow the display of the information to display advertisements to an Internet user browsing the World Wide Web.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Megiddo-Muto fails to disclose a method wherein said information display is comprised of electrically powered display elements. However, Rice teaches a method wherein said information display is comprised of electrically powered display elements (Column 4 lines 17-20). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Megiddo-Muto's method with Rice's teaching. Motivation to so do would have been to allow the display of the information to display advertisements to an Internet user browsing the World Wide Web.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F. Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Mondays through Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro  
Patent Examiner



Application/Control Number: 10/039,740

Page 8

Art Unit: 2174

Art Unit 2174

RFP

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100